



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,369	04/05/2001	Wolfgang Schulz	SCHULZ 2	4003

1444 7590 02/14/2006

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/826,369

Applicant(s)

SCHULZ, WOLFGANG

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The response filed on 12/9/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown et al. (hereinafter referred to as Shown).

Regarding claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12, Hermes discloses a woven sail/awning fabric comprising substantially entirely polyester yarns (see entire document including column 6, lines 21-62). Hermes is silent with regards to the type of polyester yarn, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional polyester awning yarns. Ferrari provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the art to use continuous filaments (see entire document including column 4, lines 40-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the polyester yarns in the form of continuous filament yarns motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes.

Hermes discloses that the polyester fabric may be dyed (column 3, lines 10-22), but Hermes does not specifically mention anthraquinone-based disperse dye. Speck (see entire document including column 1, lines 15-18 and lines 45-59 and the Examples), Hildreth (see entire document including column 1, lines 16-60 and column 2, lines 3-16), and Shown (see entire document including columns 1, lines 14-26 and column 3, line 73 through column 4, line 51) each disclose a process of wet-dyeing polyester with an anthraquinone-based disperse dye. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to wet-dye the polyester fabric of Hermes by any of the processes disclosed by Speck, Hildreth, or Show, because the dye would provide the awning fabric with a desired color having good fastness properties.

Regarding claim 2, Hermes is silent with regards to a specific awning weight, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional awning weights. Ferrari provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the awning fabric art to use a weight per unit area of about 70 to 350 g/sqm (column 4, lines 40-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the fabric with a weight per unit area of about 70 to 350 g/sqm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes.

Regarding claim 4, Hermes discloses that a UV block may be provided (column 3, lines 23-62).

Regarding claims 11-12, Hermes discloses that the woven polyester textile material is an awning (column 6, lines 21-29). The awning disclosed by Hermes may be used as a sun room awning, therefore, the awning disclosed by Hermes is considered a sun room awning.

Art Unit: 1771

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 above, and further in view of JP Publication No. 06-192972 to Uchida et al. (hereinafter referred to as Uchida).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Hermes discloses that any desired dye may be used that is compatible with polyester (column 4, lines 25-51), but Hermes does not appear to specifically mention the use of a triazine-derivative based UV block. Uchida discloses that a triazine-derivative based UV block may be applied to dyed polyester to improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester (see entire document). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a triazine-derivative based UV block, as taught by Uchida, because the UV block would improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known UV block on the basis of its suitability.

Regarding claim 6, Hermes does not mention the shape of the yarn, but the examiner takes Official Notice that yarns conventionally have round cross sections. Considering that Hermes fails to teach or suggest an unconventional yarn shape, it appears that the yarn of Hermes possesses a round cross section.

Art Unit: 1771

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown in view of JP Publication No. 06-192972 to Uchida as applied to claims 5 and 6 above, and further in view of USPN 5,565,264 to Howland.

Hermes does not specifically mention the shape of the yarn, but Howland discloses that it is known in the sail/awning art to use round yarns (column 2, lines 21-39 and column 3, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the yarns of Hermes round, as taught by Howland, because round polyester yarns are conventionally used, provide structural support and stability, and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known yarn cross sectional shape on the basis of its suitability.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 above, and further in view of USPN 4,719,954 to Curtis et al. (hereinafter referred to as Curtis).

Hermes does not mention articulated arms, but Curtis discloses that it is known in the art to construct an awning with articulated arms (see entire document including Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide articulated arms to the awning of Hermes, because such a modification would have been motivated by the desire to improve the functionality of the awning.

Art Unit: 1771

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 above, and further in view of USPN 5,565,264 to Howland.

Hermes does not specifically mention the shape of the yarn, but Howland discloses that it is known in the sail/awning art to use round yarns (column 2, lines 21-39 and column 3, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the yarns of Hermes round, as taught by Howland, because round polyester yarns are conventionally used, provide structural support and stability, and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known yarn cross sectional shape on the basis of its suitability.

Hermes is silent with regards to specific weft/warp density, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weft/warp density. Howland provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the sail/awning art to use a densely woven fabric having a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm to provide the woven fabric with high resistance to penetration (column 2, lines 21-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the woven fabric with a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes and to provide the woven fabric with high resistance to penetration.

Art Unit: 1771

Regarding delustrants and lubricants, Hermes does not mention any delustrants or lubricants, therefore, it appears that the awning fabric contains an amount of zero delustrants and lubricants.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown in view of USPN 5,565,264 to Howland as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of JP Publication No. 06-192972 to Uchida.

Hermes discloses that any desired dye may be used that is compatible with polyester (column 4, lines 25-51), but Hermes does not appear to specifically mention the use of a triazine-derivative based UV block. Uchida discloses that a triazine-derivative based UV block may be applied to dyed polyester to improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester (see entire document). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a triazine-derivative based UV block, as taught by Uchida, because the UV block would improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known UV block on the basis of its suitability.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 above, and further in view of USPN 5,565,264 to Howland in view of USPN 5,652,057 to Delker.

Hermes does not specifically mention the shape of the yarn, but Howland discloses that it is known in the sail/awning art to use round yarns (column 2, lines 21-39 and column 3, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the yarns of Hermes round, as taught by Howland, because round polyester yarns are conventionally used, provide structural support and stability, and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known yarn cross sectional shape on the basis of its suitability.

Hermes is silent with regards to specific weft/warp density, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weft/warp density. Howland provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the sail/awning art to use a densely woven fabric having a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm to provide the woven fabric with high resistance to penetration (column 2, lines 21-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the woven fabric with a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes and to provide the woven fabric with high resistance to penetration.

Regarding delustrants and lubricants, Hermes does not mention any delustrants or lubricants, but Delker discloses that delustrants and lubricants may be added to polyester in an amount of no greater than 0.05% (see entire document including column 9, lines 35-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 1771

made to include these additives in the polyester of Hermes, motivated by the desire to improve the properties of the polyester fabric.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown in view of USPN 5,565,264 to Howland in view of USPN 5,652,057 to Delker as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of JP Publication No. 06-192972 to Uchida.

Hermes discloses that any desired dye may be used that is compatible with polyester (column 4, lines 25-51), but Hermes does not appear to specifically mention the use of a triazine-derivative based UV block. Uchida discloses that a triazine-derivative based UV block may be applied to dyed polyester to improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester (see entire document). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a triazine-derivative based UV block, as taught by Uchida, because the UV block would improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known UV block on the basis of its suitability.

11. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 above, and further in view of USPN 6,146,759 to Land.

Hermes is silent with regards to specific weft/warp density, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weft/warp density. Land provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the woven polyester fabric art to

Art Unit: 1771

use a densely woven fabric having a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm (column 5, lines 33-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the woven fabric with a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes.

Regarding delustrants and lubricants, Hermes does not mention any delustrants or lubricants, therefore, it appears that the awning fabric contains an amount of zero delustrants and lubricants. Regarding the claimed round cross section, Hermes does not mention the shape of the yarn, but the examiner takes Official Notice that yarns conventionally have round cross sections. Considering that Hermes fails to teach or suggest an unconventional yarn shape, it appears that the yarn of Hermes possesses a round cross section.

12. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown in view of USPN 6,146,759 to Land as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of JP Publication No. 06-192972 to Uchida.

Hermes discloses that any desired dye may be used that is compatible with polyester (column 4, lines 25-51), but Hermes does not appear to specifically mention the use of a triazine-derivative based UV block. Uchida discloses that a triazine-derivative based UV block may be applied to dyed polyester to improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester (see entire document). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 1771

invention was made to use a triazine-derivative based UV block, as taught by Uchida, because the UV block would improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known UV block on the basis of its suitability.

13. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 11-12 above, and further in view of USPN 6,146,759 to Land in view of USPN 5,652,057 to Delker.

Hermes is silent with regards to specific weft/warp density, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weft/warp density. Land provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the woven polyester fabric art to use a densely woven fabric having a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm (column 5, lines 33-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the woven fabric with a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes.

Regarding delustrants and lubricants, Hermes does not mention any delustrants or lubricants, but Delker discloses that delustrants and lubricants may be added to polyester in an amount of no greater than 0.05% (see entire document including column 9, lines 35-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 1771

made to include these additives in the polyester of Hermes, motivated by the desire to improve the properties of the polyester fabric.

Regarding the claimed round cross section, Hermes does not mention the shape of the yarn, but the examiner takes Official Notice that yarns conventionally have round cross sections. Considering that Hermes fails to teach or suggest an unconventional yarn shape, it appears that the yarn of Hermes possesses a round cross section.

14. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,943,105 to Hermes in view of USPN 4,052,521 to Ferrari in view of anyone of USPN 2,757,064 to Speck, USPN 3,203,751 to Hildreth, or USPN 3,390,947 to Shown in view of USPN 6,146,759 to Land in view of USPN 5,652,057 to Delker as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of JP Publication No. 06-192972 to Uchida.

Hermes discloses that any desired dye may be used that is compatible with polyester (column 4, lines 25-51), but Hermes does not appear to specifically mention the use of a triazine-derivative based UV block. Uchida discloses that a triazine-derivative based UV block may be applied to dyed polyester to improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester (see entire document). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a triazine-derivative based UV block, as taught by Uchida, because the UV block would improve the light fastness of the dyed polyester and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known UV block on the basis of its suitability.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 12/9/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to use continuous filaments. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hermes discloses a woven sail/awning fabric comprising substantially entirely polyester yarns (see entire document including column 6, lines 21-62). Hermes is silent with regards to the type of polyester yarn, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional polyester awning yarns. Ferrari provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the art to use continuous filaments (see entire document including column 4, lines 40-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the polyester yarns in the form of continuous filament yarns motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes.

In response, the applicant asserts that while Hermes uses a UV light absorber, Ferrari provides a plastic coating on the fabric. The applicant asserts that one skilled in the art would not attempt to combine the references because of the "dilemma" between choosing the UV light absorber or the plastic coating. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant is arguing motivation to alter the fabric of Hermes with a plastic coating, which is not being suggested by the current rejection. Applicant's argument is not commensurate in scope with the current rejection.

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to dye the polyester fabric of Hermes.

Art Unit: 1771

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hermes discloses that the polyester fabric may be dyed (column 3, lines 10-22), but Hermes does not specifically mention anthraquinone-based disperse dye. Speck (see entire document including column 1, lines 15-18 and lines 45-59 and the Examples), Hildreth (see entire document including column 1, lines 16-60 and column 2, lines 3-16), and Shown (see entire document including columns 1, lines 14-26 and column 3, line 73 through column 4, line 51) each disclose a process of wet-dyeing polyester with an anthraquinone-based disperse dye. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to wet-dye the polyester fabric of Hermes by any of the processes disclosed by Speck, Hildreth, or Show, because the dye would provide the awning fabric with a desired color having good fastness properties.

The applicant asserts that the PTO fails take into account the “advantages” achieved by the present invention. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant has failed to show, or attempt to show, how any results or “advantages” are unexpected. The applicant is reminded that any differences between the claimed invention and the prior art may be expected to result in some differences in properties. The issue is whether the properties differ to such an extent that the difference is really unexpected.

Regarding Howland, the applicant asserts that the claimed weft/warp density is not made obvious by the applied prior art. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hermes is silent with regards to specific weft/warp density, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weft/warp density. Howland provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the sail/awning art to use a densely woven fabric having a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm to

Art Unit: 1771

provide the woven fabric with high resistance to penetration (column 2, lines 21-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the woven fabric with a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes and to provide the woven fabric with high resistance to penetration.

In response to applicant's argument that Howland is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Howland is in the field of applicant's endeavor which is the sail/awning art (see column 2, lines 33-35 of Howland and column 6, lines 21-22 of Hermes).

Regarding Delker, the applicant asserts that there is nothing in Delker that relates to the features of the currently claimed fabric. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hermes does not mention any delustrants or lubricants, but Delker discloses that delustrants and lubricants may be added to polyester in an amount of no greater than 0.05% (see entire document including column 9, lines 35-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include these additives in the polyester of Hermes, motivated by the desire to improve the properties of the polyester fabric.

Regarding Land, Hermes is silent with regards to specific weft/warp density, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional weft/warp density. Land provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the woven

Art Unit: 1771

polyester fabric art to use a densely woven fabric having a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm (column 5, lines 33-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the woven fabric with a weft density of about 35-50 filaments per cm and a warp rate of about 20-25 filaments per cm motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Hermes.

The applicant asserts that it is improper to cite Land for its weft/warp density teaching without also employing the fiberglass fibers of Land in the fabric of Hermes. The examiner respectfully disagrees. There is no disclosure in Land that the weave density taught is dependent on the material of the fibers. As such, the weave density teaching is generic to all such fabrics.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1771


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

atp

973, 1/31/06
ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER


TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700